

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 2, and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 2.

In FIG. 2, numerical designations 116 and 222 have been added to the drawings to correspond with the specification. No new matter has been added.

Replacement Sheets (1 page)

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending. Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-15 have been amended. Claims 6, 11 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 17-18 are newly submitted. FIG. 2 has been amended to correspond with the specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 17-18 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 13-16 were objected to as having incorrect claim dependencies. Applicant has corrected the claim dependencies of claims 13-15 (claim 16 has been cancelled). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

II. The § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,615,406 (“Amberg”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,373 (“Bearden”).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer manufacturing system including a first server storing a plurality of boot images, and including a system under test (SUT). The system under test (SUT) includes a network adapter and a boot loader. The boot loader loads a first boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) during a first part of a manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT), and the boot loader further load a second boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) during a second part of the manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT). The first boot image corresponds to a first operating system and the second boot image corresponds to a second operating system that is different from the first operating system.

A. Amberg Fails to Disclose a Boot Loader Loading a First Boot Image onto a System Under Test (SUT) During a First Part of a Manufacturing Process of the System Under Test (SUT) and Loading a Second Boot Image onto a System Under Test (SUT) During a Second Part of the Manufacturing Process of the System Under Test (SUT) in which the First Boot Image and the Second Boot Image Correspond to Different Operating Systems

As described in the background section of Applicant's specification, conventional computer manufacturing processes "rely on booting one particular operating system that the manufacturing process tools are standardized on" (specification page 2, lines 20-21).

Amberg describes such a conventional manufacturing process in which only a single, particular operating system is loaded onto a computer system (i.e., a target system 160) during manufacturing of the computer system. In particular, Amberg specifically discloses that a "target system 160 might include a certain brand of hard drive, a particular type of monitor, a certain brand of processor, and a particular version of an operating system" (col. 3, ll. 49-52). Prior to shipping a target system to a customer, such components are installed on the target system and tested (col. 3, ll. 52-54). Other than the unique methods for testing a target system using a step table, the basic concepts of Amberg were addressed as prior art in the Applicant's specification.

Specifically, while Amberg discloses testing a particular version of an operating system on a target system, Amberg fails to disclose a boot loader loading a first boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) *during a first part of a manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT)*, and loading a second boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) *during a second part of the manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT)*, in which the first boot image corresponds to a first operating system and the second boot image corresponds to a second operating system that is different from the

first operating system (emphasis added). Instead, Amberg (as with other conventional manufacturing processes) tests only a single operating system on a computer system during manufacturing.

B. Bearden Fails to Disclose a Boot Loader Loading a First Boot Image onto a System Under Test (SUT) During a First Part of a Manufacturing Process of the System Under Test (SUT) and Loading a Second Boot Image onto a System Under Test (SUT) During a Second Part of the Manufacturing Process of the System Under Test (SUT) in which the First Boot Image and the Second Boot Image Correspond to Different Operating Systems

Bearden discloses a method and system for installing files in a computing system (see Abstract). Bearden discloses only testing a single operating system during testing. In particular, Bearden discloses computing devices 102, 104, 106, and 108 (FIG. 1) that execute a Microsoft Windows operating system (col. 2, ll. 48-52). Thus, Bearden (as with Amberg) fails to disclose a boot loader loading a first boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) during a first part of a manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT), and loading a second boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) during a second part of the manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT), in which the first boot image corresponds to a first operating system and the second boot image corresponds to a second operating system that is different from the first operating system, as recited in claim 1.

C. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Neither Amberg nor Bearden a boot loader loading a first boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) during a first part of a manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT), and loading a second boot image of the plurality of boot images onto the system under test (SUT) during a second part of the manufacturing process of the system under test (SUT), in which the first boot image corresponds to a first operating system and the second boot image corresponds to a second operating system that is different from the first operating system, as recited in claim 1. Consequently, the combination of Amberg and Bearden cannot render claim 1 obvious.

D. Other Independent Claims

Claims 7 and 12 each incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claims 7 and 12 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over Amberg and Bearden (either alone or in combination) for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 17-18 are allowable over references cited above, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

December 19, 2006

/Kelvin M. Vivian/
Kelvin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 475-1448